

Interview Summary

Pursuant to MPEP § 713.04, the Applicant submits the present description of the substance of the interview conducted between counsel for the Applicant and the Examiner on 03/20/2008.

A) No exhibits were shown and no demonstrations were conducted.

B) The discussion was focused on independent claim 26.

C) The specific prior art discussed included U.S. Patent No. 6,343,264 to Fenton et al.; U.S. Patent No. 5,687,737 to Branham et al.; U.S. Patent No. 4,737,921 to Goldwesser; and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0057884 of Dowling et al.

D) Potential amendments to the claims included amending claim 26 to include the particular types of light set forth in dependent claim 28, but with the transitional term “comprising” and not “consisting”.

(E) As noted in the Examiner’s Interview Summary, the general thrust of the principal argument of the Applicant was that neither Branham nor any other prior art reference teaches the display of different types of light sources, such as fluorescent and incandescent, as claim 26 required. The Applicant noted that reference to “direct and ambient virtual light sources” in Branham (col. 7, lines 34-35) does not disclose the means for controlling a **type** of light source since direct and

ambient light cannot be of different types (i.e., fluorescent, incandescent, etc.) of light. They are not types of light at all. Ambient light is merely available light of without regard to type, and direct light is merely “lighting in which the greater part of the light goes directly from the source to the area lit” (Merriam-Webster’s Online Dictionary”), again without regard to type. As such, incandescent light can be applied in ambiently and directly.

(F) The examiner also expressed concerns regarding the final two subparagraphs of claim 26.

(G) No final agreement was reached.